



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,034	11/28/2001	Jens Grieswald	7123 US	1255
30078	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
TEKTRONIX, INC. 14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW) BEAVERTON, OR 97077-0001			HOM, SHICK C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/997,034	Applicant(s) GRIESWALD, JENS	
	Examiner Shick C. Hom	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 8 line 1 which recite dependence from "claims 7 or 8" appears to be a typo, if that is true, change to ---claims 6 or 7---; likewise, in claim 9, which recite dependence from "claim 9" appears to be a typo, change to ---claim 8---. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the

Art Unit: 2616

United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McElhaney, Jr. et al. (6,823,479).

Regarding claims 1-3, 6:

McElhaney, Jr. et al. disclose a circuit for testing a communication system that is subdivided into functional layers, corresponding to the OSI reference model, comprises a port that allows communication by a test apparatus directly with any layer that is higher than a first layer of the functional layers without the communication previously having to pass through the first layer (see col. 1 lines 26-42 and col. 1 line 66 to col. 2 line 11 which recite the network tool, topology independent and which does not have to be reconfigured as the network changes, being provided for testing capabilities across OSI layers two through seven clearly anticipate the circuit for testing as claimed); outputting response data from the port to the test apparatus; and analyzing the response data by the test apparatus (see col. 5 lines 21-26 which recite the tool including isolation and root cause analysis of the test data).

Regarding claims 7-10:

Art Unit: 2616

McElhaney, Jr. et al. disclose the step of inputting the test data comprising of a stimulation signal into the port; and wherein the response data comprising of a monitoring signal is a response to the stimulation signal (see col. 2 line 53 to col. 3 line 5 which recite sending TCP ping and HTTP ping and receiving response information; and col. 3 lines 28-45 which recite sending test mail, ping signal, and test message for measuring response time clearly anticipate the test data, stimulation signal and receiving response data and monitoring signal in response).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElhaney, Jr. et al. (6,823,479) in view of Warren (6,381,721).

Art Unit: 2616

For claims 4 and 5, McElhaney, Jr. et al. disclose the circuit arrangement described in paragraph 3 of this office action. For claims 4 and 5, McElhaney, Jr. et al. disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip as recited in claim 4 and wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as recited in claim 5.

Warren from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach that it is known to provide the processing of the communication is realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip (see col. 1 lines 55-67) and wherein the processing of the communication is realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer (see col. 3 line 43 to col. 4 line 16 and the first and second chip in claim 9). Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the processing of the communication being realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip and the processing of the communication being realized on a first chip and the port on a

Art Unit: 2616

second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as taught by Warren in the circuit arrangement of McElhaney, Jr. et al. The motivation for providing the processing of the communication being realized on a single chip, with the port being provided on the chip and the processing of the communication being realized on a first chip and the port on a second chip, the first and second chips being linked with each other for data transfer as taught by Warren in the circuit arrangement of McElhaney, Jr. et al. being that it provides the desirable added feature of integrated circuit technology to the circuit arrangement of McElhaney, Jr. et al.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

Art Unit: 2616

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick C. Hom whose telephone number is 571-272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SH 5H

Seema S. Rao
SEEMA S. RAO 5/1/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600